

second transmission that is sufficiently unique to the first transmission that the original transmitter will recognize the second transmission as a response. It is not necessary that the station sending the second transmission have an address or other identification of the station that sent the first transmission. The receiving station simply forms a second transmission that uses some information from the first transmission, enough that the second transmission is sufficiently unique to the first transmission, but with use of fewer bits than the destination address of the first transmission. By making the second transmission have this unique character, the transmitter that sent the first transmission can tell that the second transmission is a response to the first transmission.

The examiner has also rejected claims 1 and 4 under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Gleeson. The examiner is urged to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Gleeson teaches the use of tokens to replace the header field in each of a plurality of packets being sent between two stations. Gleeson does not teach operating a station according to claim 1 or claim 4. Both claims require that a station transmit

on the transmission medium a second frame transmission including information from the first frame transmission other than the destination address, the information from the first frame transmission occupying fewer bits than the destination address but being sufficiently unique to the first frame transmission as to convey that the second frame transmission is a response to the first frame transmission.

Gleeson teaches nothing even remotely comparable to this key element of claims 1 and 4. All Gleeson teaches is that certain header fields can be replaced with prearranged tokens. There is not the slightest suggestion that any transmission in Gleeson include "information from a first frame transmission *** sufficiently unique to the first frame transmission to convey that the second frame transmission is a response to the first frame transmission." The examiner may be correct that Gleeson suggests that the tokens "can be any unique field", but that falls miles short of teaching that the tokens be formed from information from an earlier received transmission and be sufficiently unique to convey that they are a response to the earlier received transmission. Of course, the tokens are unique, as that is necessary so that a received token can be replaced at the receiver with the header fields that the token represents. But that has nothing to do with teaching

that a second transmission is based on a first transmission in a manner that is sufficiently unique to the first transmission as to convey that the second transmission is a response to the first.

The examiner also points to Gleeson's mention of a "checksum" field. But this does nothing to bolster the examiner's position. The checksum field is simply one of the header fields that the tokens replace. It has nothing to do with the nature of the tokens. And even if, contrary to fact, Gleeson had taught using as a token a checksum field formed by processing the contents of a header field, that would still not be a second transmission based on a first transmission in a manner that is sufficiently unique to the first transmission as to convey that the second transmission is a response to the first.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 4 are in condition for allowance.

The remaining claims are all properly dependent on one or more of claims 1 and 4, and thus allowable therewith. Each of the dependent claims adds one or more further limitations that enhance patentability, but those limitations are not presently relied upon. For that reason, and not because applicants agree with the examiner, no rebuttal is offered to the examiner's reasons for rejecting the dependent claims.

Allowance of the application is requested.

Enclosed is a \$450.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 18, 2006

/grogerlee/

G. Roger Lee
Reg. No. 28,963

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906